

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the issue of affirmative action. It is my understanding that a bill is being introduced today which will prevent the Federal Government from taking affirmative steps to remedy the still widespread discrimination that we have in employment, contracting, and education.

Today, discrimination is still rampant. A recent study conducted by the Fair Housing Council found that minorities are discriminated against 40 percent of the times that they seek to rent an apartment. Repealing affirmative action will, therefore, have the practical effect of resegregating America. The repeal of affirmative action programs in both Texas and California gives us a peek at what happens when we eliminate affirmative action.

So we must ask the opponents of affirmative action if they achieve their goals when minority admissions to law schools in Texas and California dropped precipitously in spite of evidence that shows that minorities, when given the opportunity, will perform as well as their majority counterparts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I ask, how far do we have to turn the clocks back to appease those that are disgruntled, because discrimination is being remedied?

IT IS HIGH TIME FOR AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, as James McDougal, former business partner of President Clinton, begins his prison sentence today, I think we should take a look back at some of the additions to the American vocabulary in just the last few years: Whitewater, Filegate, Troopergate, Travelgate, Lippogate, Pillowgate, Donorgate, Indo-gate, and who could forget Buddhist Templegate.

Goodness gracious, and Janet Reno says there is no need for an independent counsel? Yeah.

AMERICANS ARE FED UP WITH FEDERAL BUREAUCRATS

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in Boston for the last 14 days the Sweeney family has literally barricaded their property, fighting the Federal Government who they say is trying to take their home. Now, I do not know who is right or wrong in this case, but one thing is for sure. Many American people are fed up with fat cat government bureaucrats.

Open your eyes, Congress. EPA, IRS, FBI, FDIC, ATF, intimidation, liens and seizures, technicalities, regulations, on and on, and every single day more messages and signals keep com-

ing to Washington; and no one here seems to be listening.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just Texas and Idaho, now it is Michigan, New York, and even the wealthy suburbs of Boston. I say, Mr. Speaker, what is next? Maybe another Tea Party? Do not be surprised when a nation that forgets their history is many times apt to revisit it.

TAX CUTS FOR PEOPLE WHO PAY TAXES

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it should be a no-brainer that tax cuts should go to people who are taxpayers. Many Americans might well wonder how anyone could even think of, let alone give, a tax cut to people who do not pay taxes. But remember, this is Washington.

Words mean nothing. That is why tax cuts are still a defining difference between Republicans and Democrats. Republicans are for tax cuts.

Republicans believe that hard-working Americans deserve to keep and spend more of the money that they earn. For too long, Democrats opposed any tax cuts for working Americans as gifts from Washington to the so-called rich.

Now, some Democrats claim they support tax cuts. However, actions speak louder than words. It turns out the Democrats and the President's proposed tax credit for children would transfer more money from the pockets of taxpayers to the pockets of people who pay no taxes.

Americans are wondering, Mr. Speaker, why is the Democrats' child tax credit more like welfare spending than a tax cut?

REPUBLICAN TAX PROPOSAL IS DISAPPOINTING

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disappointment in the Republican tax proposal. Under this plan, the majority of the tax benefits go to the wealthiest Americans, those making over \$250,000 a year; almost 58 percent of their tax breaks go to people making over \$250,000 a year.

I think that we ought to provide the bulk of tax relief to working, middle-class families in this country, to the families who are trying to figure out how to pay their monthly bills, put food on their table, send their kids to school, and provide for a secure retirement and be able to afford health care. These are the families who could use tax relief in this country today.

Let me just say that this is simply not a Democratic issue. One of my Republican colleagues, in a television ap-

pearance with me this morning, stated that providing big tax breaks for families who make over \$250,000 a year is not the right way to go. I encourage more of my Republican colleagues, speak out about the need to provide tax relief to those families who really need it: hard-working middle-class Americans.

□ 1415

INTRODUCTION OF THE ELECTRIC UTILITY NITROGEN OXIDE LIMITATION ACT OF 1997

(Ms. CARSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, the Electric Utility Nitrogen Oxide Limitation Act of 1997. In the current debate concerning the new EPA rulemaking for clean air, I trust that my bill will pass and provide an alternative for Members who want to vote for clean air.

My bill will reduce by 55 percent the nitrogen oxide levels emitted by fossil fuel-burning electric utility plants by the year 2000. It sets a simple standard of 0.35 pound per million Btu to be met by the electric utility plants by the end of the year 2000.

It will also ensure that electric competition encourages, not discourages, responsible, efficient emission control. It is a bill that is proconsumer and proenvironment. It will ensure competition for utilities, but not at the expense of air quality.

This bill will do all of this without amending the Clean Air Act. While the debate rages on concerning EPA rulemaking and the States debate standards that will not be in place until 10 years from now, I encourage my colleagues to join me.

AN IMMENSE AMBITION FOR POWER

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, "Attention turns to Aristide as the Haitian Government crumbles," says the news report this weekend. "An immense ambition for power" is responsible for insecurity and disorder in the Capital, Port-au-Prince. This is how one-time confidante Paul DeJean describes former President and his former friend, Jean-Bertrand Aristide of Haiti.

In fact, this sentiment is nothing extraordinary. If we peruse the weekend press on Haiti, it appears to be a mainstream opinion as Haiti drifts deeper into misery and despair. Reports from the wire and from Michael Norton of the Washington Post describe a litany of Aristide's increasingly obvious efforts to advance his own personal ambition at the expense of economic recovery and at the expense of democratization in Haiti.

President Clinton's man in Haiti is systematically destroying democracy there. Unfortunately, this comes at the expense of the American taxpayer. Members will remember that \$3 billion of democracy building we just provided? What, we have to ask, is the White House going to do about their man in Haiti? Is the Clinton White House backing democracy in Haiti, or is it backing another darling of the left strong man? Is this Papa Doc all over again? We need an answer.

THE REPUBLICANS ARE OUT OF TOUCH WITH REAL PEOPLE IN THIS COUNTRY

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are desperately out of touch with real people in this country. First, they try to hold up disaster relief to flood victims. Then they say that people trying to move from welfare to work are not entitled to the minimum wage or basic workplace protections.

Now the Republicans are trying to push through a tax bill that gives huge tax breaks to millionaires and provides almost no relief to the people who need it the most, middle-income and working families. The bulk of their tax cut will go to those families making over \$237,000 a year. That is wrong.

What message are the Republicans sending to hardworking Americans? They want to give a \$10,000 tax deduction to upper-income families who can already afford to send their kids to college. Yet they propose a \$500-per-child tax credit that penalizes working mothers with children in child care.

Mr. Speaker, right now parents are forced to take two and three jobs just to feed their families. These are the people who need tax relief. Instead, the Republicans have loaded this tax bill down with gifts to their wealthy friends. It is wrong, Mr. Speaker. It is wrong, and we will not allow it.

THE CHOICE IS CLEAR: PASS TAX CUTS AS PART OF A BALANCED BUDGET

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, politics is all about choices. One of the biggest choices facing lawmakers is the direction of the U.S. economy. We can go down the path of higher taxation, more welfare benefits, and more regulation. This is known as the European path. It is also the path chosen by liberal Democrats.

The European path is a lot of fun for politicians. They can play Santa Claus, but it is not so much fun for the people. Just ask the people out of work in Germany or France, where the unem-

ployment rate is twice the jobless rate here in the United States.

The other path is a path in just the opposite direction: lower taxes, less regulation, welfare reform. That is the direction we want for the U.S. economy. That is the direction we want for Americans looking for a job, Americans looking for a better job, Americans looking for higher-paying jobs.

This is the time to choose directions. This time the choice is clear. We must pass the tax cuts as part of a balanced budget. Choices, Mr. Speaker, that is what politics is all about.

THE DEMOCRATIC ALTERNATIVE: TARGETED TAX BREAKS TO THE MIDDLE CLASS, NOT TO THE VERY WEALTHY

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to call for tax fairness, a simple proposition. Democrats have supported balanced budgets and Democrats support reasonable tax cuts, but not tax breaks exclusively for the wealthy.

The American public needs to know that under the Republican approach to tax cuts, the top 35 percent, people making over \$247,000 a year, will get two-thirds of the benefit. There is a Democratic alternative. We take a more Robin Hood approach to tax cuts. We suggest that two-thirds of the tax benefits ought to go to the middle class, people who make \$40,000 and \$50,000, people who make \$20,000 and \$30,000.

So the proposition is really very simple. It is not a question of whether we want tax cuts. We want tax cuts. What we want are fair tax cuts that benefit most of the Americans in this country. That is the Democratic alternative: Targeted tax breaks to the middle class, not to the very wealthy.

A HISTORIC TAX CUT FOR AMERICANS

(Mr. COOK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I join the ranks of Republicans who are proud to tell our constituents that this Congress is giving them the first tax cuts they have had in over 16 years. I agree with those who call this budget historic, but it is historic for a lot more than just the \$85 billion that we will be returning to the pockets of working families over the next 5 years. History is going to show that 1997 marked the year when American leaders began to redefine what is and is not income.

Through these tax cuts we have taken the first step in announcing to the American people that income is not the money they carefully saved through their lives and left for their

children and their grandchildren. Income is not the assets of their family businesses they built with pride and nurtured over the years and just happened to be there when they died. Income is not the increased valuations of their homes.

I believe these tax cuts are the first step toward a simplified tax system that fairly and honestly taxes income, and a move away from a system that punishes savings and investing in our children, in our future, as our current system does.

COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT'S INITIATIVE ON RACE

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this weekend I traveled with President Clinton to San Diego, CA. There the President announced his initiative on race: One America in the 21st century.

The President has appointed a commission of highly respected Americans to examine this issue and call for a year-long dialog to take place across our Nation. In the address, the President stated, "We must be one American community, based on respect for one another and our shared values."

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. There is no issue more important to the future of our country than building the bridge of trust and understanding between people of all religions, all nationalities, and all colors.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Clinton for launching this bold initiative. Not since Lyndon Johnson has a President so directly and sincerely addressed the important issue of race. There are those who have criticized the President's initiative, who would use any opportunity to attack the President. I hope and pray that the President's critics will cease their attacks. This issue is too important to the future of our Nation to be exploited for political gain.

Thank you, Mr. President, for your inspiring words this weekend, and for beginning the process of healing and bringing our Nation together.

LET US PASS THE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT AS PART OF THE BALANCED BUDGET AGREEMENT

(Mr. ADERHOLT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADERHOLT. Mr. Speaker, the more Government taxes, the more it discourages people from doing productive work. The more Government taxes, the more it discourages business from increasing output and creating jobs. The more Government taxes, the more it discourages people from saving and investing. The more Government taxes, the harder it is for families to make ends meet, the harder it is for